

August 28, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H11345

were printed at the expense of the Chinese Government.

The most distressing fact is that according to the officials of our Post Office Department they must deliver this mail printed by a foreign alien government with the intent to cause murder of American citizens and soldiers and to bring about the disruption of our system of government.

According to the officials in the Post Office Department, they can only refuse to handle mail even from foreign governments if it advocates the murder of the President or the violent overthrow of the Government. Their reasons as stated are that the recent rulings of the Supreme Court, as related to freedom of speech, protects the right of such persons as the Chinese Communists or, in this instance, the fugitive from American justice, Williams, to flood our Nation with such hate propaganda calling for the murder of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am today sending a letter to the Postmaster General urging him to refuse to accept this mail, for surely as he has the authority to refuse to handle mail calling for the murder of the President, he can likewise refuse to handle mail calling for the murder of any other American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, the right of free speech is one of the most precious rights which we enjoy. It is a right which must be preserved, maintained and protected. However, this right does not grant a license to advocate murder, and the right of free speech must be exercised in light of other valid laws in the interest of our Government.

Certainly the most overwhelming right, though possibly not expressly proclaimed in print, granted to the American people by our Constitution and Bill of Rights is that right of the Republic of the United States to continue an existence, the right of self-preservation, and in the interest of preserving the domestic tranquility and providing for the future welfare of our Nation, we have every right and indeed a duty to the American people to refuse to allow our mails to be used for the purpose of bringing about our destruction and setting one citizen against another for the purpose of murder. I deem this to be one of the inalienable rights granted to us by our forefathers and framers of our Constitution.

BYPASSING CONGRESS IN FIAT LOAN

(Mr. LIPSCOMB asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to learn that the administration apparently is moving brazenly ahead with its intentions to render assistance to the U.S.S.R. in the building of the Fiat automotive factory.

In spite of the fact that legislation which bears on the Fiat plant proposal is under active consideration in Congress at this very time, the Department of Commerce has given clearance to reexport American technical data from Italy to

the Soviet Union for use in the manufacture of parts for Fiat automobiles. Information about this reexportation has just been released by the Department of Commerce in its list of "Export Licenses Approved and Reexportations Authorized for August 22, 1967."

As many Members of the House will recall, on May 4, 1967 I discussed in detail the reasons why in my opinion the United States should not render assistance on the Soviet-Fiat automotive factory. My statement appears on pages H5105-H5108 of the May 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. To this date to my knowledge none of those reasons have become invalid and, in fact, today the reasons for denying any and all assistance related to the Soviet warmaking potential are even more imperative. Obviously vehicles of all kinds constitute warmaking potential.

As I pointed out in that statement, by early this year we had "destroyed or damaged over 9,000 trucks in North Vietnam," and that "thousands more remain." Those words seem to have been confirmed in the statement by the Secretary of Defense just last week when on August 25 he told of the large number of air strikes from January through July against the enemy. Among the targets reported destroyed he said were "over 4,100 vehicles." To date therefore our airmen have risked their lives, and in some cases given their lives, to destroy or damage more than 13,000 enemy vehicles.

Can it be possible that the administration is ignoring Soviet involvement not only in Southeast Asia but elsewhere? Has it already brushed aside the events of last May and early June in the Middle East? The following headline appeared in the Los Angeles Times on May 22: "Egypt Orders Military Reservists Mobilized—Russian-Built Trucks Rumble Continuously Over Cairo Streets."

On May 4 I also stated that:

If the Soviets were required to design and build machine tools and equipment which closely approximate those they seek from abroad in the Fiat deal then they would probably have to use engineers, technicians and capital goods which otherwise could be employed in programs related to Soviet military and space endeavors.

That point of requiring the Soviets to design and engineer their own tools and equipment seems to directly relate to the action just taken by the Department of Commerce in authorizing reexportation of technical data for the Fiat plant that I would like here to reprint a statement from a letter written by the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Lt. Gen. John F. Carroll. General Carroll's April 25, 1967 letter to me states:

It is true that, if engineering and production resources were allocated to the design and fabrication of such machine tools and equipment, the resources would have to be taken from other programs, either military or civilian. In the past the Soviet Union has given priority to military programs over civil programs, and it is believed that—barring a major change in Soviet policy—this practice will continue.

The Department of Commerce certainly must be fully aware that the general issue of U.S. assistance to help

construct a Fiat automobile plant in the U.S.S.R. is under active discussion at the present time in the Congress in connection with H.R. 6649 and S. 1155, relating to extending the life of the Export-Import Bank and increasing its lending authority.

The Department must also be aware that in acting on S. 1155, the Senate approved an amendment to prohibit the Bank from providing assistance to the Soviet Union or to any intermediary nations for the purchase of products which would aid the Soviet Union in constructing automobile manufacturing plants. While this legislation of course relates to Export-Import Bank financing and does not relate directly to the matter of issuance of export licenses or reexportation authorizations as such, obviously these are but two different aspects of the larger issue of assisting in the construction of an automotive manufacturing plant in the U.S.S.R.

In my opinion it is a matter of serious concern that the Department would go ahead and issue this reexportation authority at this time and I have today called on the Department of Commerce to rescind its action in this case in the interest of our national security and welfare.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TOTAL APPROACH TO THE CITIES—CONGRESS MUST ENACT THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAMS FOR URBAN AMERICA

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, speaking not far from the scene of this summer's Detroit riots, President Johnson reminded us of an important responsibility to the majority of Americans now living in urban America. Most important, he told America that the approach to the cities could no longer be piecemeal—only a total attack would solve the problems of our Nation's cities.

The violence and tragic events of this summer dramatically emphasize these responsibilities.

While there is no place in our society for lawlessness and anarchy, there is also no place for slums and human misery.

The President said in Ann Arbor, 3 years ago:

It is harder and harder to live the good life in American cities today. The catalogue of ills is long. . . . Our society will never be great until our cities are great.

In his first state of the Union message, just 6 weeks after taking office, President Johnson sounded the keynote of his urban policy:

The first step is to break old patterns—to begin to think and work and plan for the development of entire metropolitan areas.

President Johnson from the start cast aside the old view of urban affairs which concentrated only on housing. He saw the need to deal effectively with such problems as schooling, employment, transportation, pollution as well as urban renewal.